

body of law does include such things as the court will interpret statutes, first of all, they will interpret them constitutionally, if it can be interpreted in that manner. They will interpret it to reach a reasonable result as opposed to an absurd result. They will give it ordinary meaning as opposed to warping it to try to come up with bad meaning. So when we are construing statutes, it may not be the best written from an English...I don't know if we have any English majors in here, but from an English perspective, it's...from an English perspective, it's probably not as well crafted as in optimal circumstances you can come down to, but that's not the...that's not the issue. The issue is, does it cover a different conduct, are we including the same thing, are people misled by it, and I don't think that's the case. I think if we look at people reading the definition, if you, if anybody in here looked at the definition, I think we all know what the definition includes, and I don't know that the Chambers amendment does anything different. Yeah, it certainly may...it certainly may be a better constructed sentence than the way we have it in the bill, but does it improve the bill enough? Does it make such a significant difference in the way of drafting that it is worth making that...worth varying from the language that at least two courts have already said this is not vague? The courts have said this does not fail for vagueness when subjected to constitutional scrutiny. I concur with that. I would agree, if Senator Chambers and I, we've said this many times on the floor, if we sat down and wanted to construct a statute, we could probably draft a much better one than a lot of the definitions we use, we could both sit down and say what kind of conduct are we seeking to proscribe, what kind of conduct are we seeking to include in a particular definition, what kind of conduct are we seeking to prohibit, and we could do that and draft better statutes. But in this particular arena...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...no, Senator Chambers, we won't do it, but in this particular arena, every single one of those definitions, every single one of those sections, every single one of those provisions would be subjected to a constitutional challenge, and Senator Chambers and I, or at least Senator Chambers has said he is extremely talented, and at this point I am going to jump in there and say maybe I will be too. Maybe we could, and I think we could draft it so we think everybody would know, but if five out of nine justices in Washington say otherwise, or for that